



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE DÉBÂCLE OF DOGMATISM

BY DAVID JAYNE HILL

ALTHOUGH during four months of secret negotiation American public opinion on the League of Nations remained unsolicited, America has at last spoken. Whatever the outward form of words may be, her voice is clearly against supernational government and for an Entente of Free Nations. The unpledged press and the great hierophants of party opposition have condemned the Constitution of a League of Nations as it was incubated at Paris, and have demanded radical changes as a condition of American support. Every interpretation by its advocates and every amendment proposed by its critics has tended to abolish the "League" and restore the "Entente."

When it was first published it seemed that the "Constitution" was intended not to solicit the cooperation of the nations to be included under it, but by their agreement to command their future action. Assailed as a super-government, it was pleaded by its defenders that it was not a government at all, but a kind of international social club, whose Executive Council possessed no real authority, and whose sole function was to make "recommendations," which might be accepted or rejected. This defense reduced it to something less than an Entente, because it threw doubt upon its sincerity of purpose.

Instead of treating the "Constitution" as meaningless for a real community of action, the critics sought to endow it with real obligations, by pruning its pretences and making it effective for some at least of its alleged purposes. It remains for the world to judge who were the sincere friends of peace; and especially of a peace to end the war in such a way that the treaty of peace, when secured, would unquestionably be enforced.

Had some open process of this kind been adopted in the beginning, it would without doubt have saved much

precious time. If it were in the order of the day to continue it deliberately after an actual peace had been declared upon conditions that would render discussion wholly free and entirely amicable, the result would be better still. Nevertheless, the chances for the Entente of Free Nations are to some degree improved even by the tardy and reluctant concession that the document alleged to have been "agreed upon" and to be "unalterable" was not too perfect to be publicly discussed.

It may not, perhaps, be too late, now that public debate is not openly proscribed as a manifestation of hostility to peace, to consider, at least in an academic manner, some of the provisions which it would still be desirable to eliminate from this document and some of the methods which it would be profitable to abandon.

The Peace Conference at Paris has suffered from too much theory and too little regard to practical results. In the meantime, while the delegates have been preoccupied with devising defenses against the consequences of a remote future, events have occurred of which they have seemed unconscious, and the irrepressible stream of human activities still flows irresistibly onward. Occurrences have at last reached a point where action must take the place of meditation, or victory will be transformed into defeat.

The theory underlying the Conference has been that all possible future wars must be prevented now; and that, unless this could be done immediately, the present war could not be ended. In other words, the League of Nations, it was held, must of necessity be a part of any treaty of peace.

This theory dates from the attempt to prepare a compromise peace by creating a future situation with which all the belligerents would be satisfied. It rests upon the assumption that while governments are often bad, peoples are always perfectly good; and that, if the governments could be overthrown and the peoples could have their way, there would never be any more war in the world.

As a proposition in political philosophy this doctrine has never yet been proved to be true. In the belief of many it is not only incapable of such proof but is erroneous. If it were true, we should be able in a very short time to secure universal peace by a general plebiscite. The truth is that all nations want peace, but they want it in their own way; and, as their own ways differ, they are not

likely to consent to perpetual peace until there is created a common interest so great that, to secure it, they are willing to forego all less urgent aspirations. The realization of such a community of interest as this is undoubtedly an ideal to be aimed at; and, in time, it may be possible to attain it. It is, however, an obvious error to insist that such a community of interest must be made universal before an existing common interest in a narrower field can be utilized as a basis for a peace of victory, in which aggression against public right has been overborne and the aggressor is rendered powerless. For unless actual aggression is defeated, is made conscious of its defeat, and is caused to suffer the consequences of it, peace becomes a mockery. A distinction must be made between a compromise peace, in which the aggressor is treated as an equal, and a peace of victory, in which he must pay the penalty of his offense; or war would become a recognized innocent diversion and peace the mere plaything of participants in a rude and dangerous game of chance. To state the matter concretely, unless the Central Powers and their allies are so weakened and punished for their crimes against the peace of the world that they will not repeat the performance at a more favorable time, the war has been lost to the Entente, and the treaty of peace, no matter what it contains, will prove ineffectual.

The community of interest on which the present peace should be made is the defeat of a common enemy. When that peace is made there will be a long period of comparative repose during which the larger problem of universal and permanent peace might be considered. If, however, the Entente Allies cannot impose a just peace in the concrete, what hope is there that they can forever maintain it in the abstract?

The truth is that proposing peace in general has taken the place of imposing peace in the actual particular situation because it was easier to imagine the theoretical potency of a League of Nations than it was to deal with realities. As a result, the common interest which the Entente had when the armistice was signed in rendering Germany powerless for harm in the future, has been held in the background by the discussion of a theory, while the separate interests of the victors in the war have seemed to most of them the only realities with which the Conference

would deal or which its conclusions would affect. Thus Great Britain has thought of her maritime supremacy and her colonial conquests, France of her future territorial security, Italy of the control of the Adriatic, Japan of her Eastern interests, Belgium of her rehabilitation, and the new nationalities of their racial integration and safety from their neighbors old and new. The representatives of the United States, on the other hand, having nothing to ask for except the adoption of their theory of universal peace, have held a position of influence which enabled them to say, "The League of Nations first, and peace with Germany afterward."

~ The inevitable consequence of such a *mise en scène* of the Conference was delay, the exaggeration of separate interests, and an effort to make the League serve, as far as possible, these particular national aims, while the original community of interest in the suppression of German aggressiveness was gradually dissipated. In brief, attention to Germany, the new nationalities, the rise and spread of Bolshevism, the growing menace of Russia even in a military sense, was withdrawn, to be fixed on getting into the theory of the League something besides abstractions. This has been in part accomplished. Dogma has answered to dogma, interest to interest, and instead of a pacifically disposed general society of nations agreeing to accept, respect, and maintain International Law as its rule of conduct, we have an organized balance of power only, dominated by five Great Powers, whose interests have been in some manner incorporated in a Constitution for a League of Nations;—all except those of the United States, which seeks nothing but the realization of ideals! If we adopt the theory that a League is a necessary preliminary to a peace with Germany, say the Entente Allies, America must agree to defend us always and everywhere. That is Europe's answer to the President's insistence on a League as a preliminary condition of peace.

The President went to Europe with an ideal. Europe welcomed him and confronted him with the result of its experience. To this experience his ideal has had to adjust itself. The result is not the realization of his expectations. He sought to reconstruct the world. He has been obliged to engage his country in a permanent defensive alliance of a kind that a very short time ago he expressly repudiated,

not merely because it is contrary to the traditions of the United States, but as he emphatically declared because it is incompatible with our national purpose.

Only four years ago he voiced his conviction by saying: "Every man who stands in this presence should examine himself and see whether he has the full conception of what it means that America should live her own life." And, referring to our relations to the rest of the world, he added:

It was not merely because of passing and transient circumstances that Washington said we must keep free from entangling alliances. It was because he saw that no country had yet set its face in the same direction in which America had set her face. We cannot form alliances with those who are not going our way; and in our might and majesty and in the confidence and definiteness of our own purpose we need not and we should not form alliances with any nation in the world.

At that time the President spoke in words which his countrymen understood. During the Great War he gradually saw that the United States could not remain isolated in a world of which it forms a part. We entered the war, as our honor compelled us to do. We became associated with Great Powers in Europe. We had a common cause, and we fought valiantly with them against a common enemy. We won a victory, and what was demanded was a peace of victory. But the President had set his mind on a peace of reconstruction. America's life was no longer to him the highest purpose. He wanted to be the creator of a new world.

From that moment the President no longer represented America. He was the victim of his obsession, the reconstructed world. He did not even care for America's consent. He did not seek it. He did not desire it. His mind was closed to it. He had a doctrine which he apparently felt he could not teach. He made no attempt to teach it. He was resolved to enforce it. Then it would be believed, because it would be no longer merely an idea, it would be a fact.

Such a determination, with all America apparently behind it—although America had not been asked to speak—could not fail to produce some result; but it was not the result intended. In the contest between the dogma that only a reconstructed world could make peace at all and the pressing necessity that peace should be promptly made, diplomacy wrung from idealism three concessions:

(1) Peace is to be guaranteed to the peacemakers by stereotyping the map of the world as they will make it;

(2) Imperialism may pass for democracy by becoming international; and

(3) Democratic leadership does not require democratic methods of procedure.

The President accepted these results, and they were embodied in the "Constitution" sent from Paris and pronounced unalterable. But American public opinion was yet to be learned; and American public opinion, even that most favorable to a League, was not satisfied with the form or the substance of this document.

A new map of Europe is undoubtedly necessary, in order to secure the safety of the countries inclined toward peace from a new outbreak of aggression; but the Constitution of a League of Nations is not satisfied with this, it demands that the boundaries of the States which are members of the League, together with all their widely scattered colonial possessions, shall for all time be protected by all the associated Powers. This is the first and most conspicuous victory of diplomacy over idealism.

To the uninitiated this Constitution is the outgrowth of new and original conceptions, arising out of the peculiar circumstances of recent international experience. It has been heralded as the application of the Christian religion to the problems of international relationship, and glorified as its consummate flower and perfect fruit.

How far this proposed League is from being either new or original will be apparent to those who will compare its provisions with those contained in "The Project of Perpetual Peace," written by the Abbé de St. Pierre, more than two hundred years ago, during the Congress of Utrecht, in 1713.

The good Abbé's purpose, like the alleged object of the League of Nations, was to make a permanent end of war, and his method was substantially that which is now proposed. His plan was as follows:

1. A contract of perpetual and irrevocable alliance between the principal sovereigns, with a diet composed of plenipotentiaries, in which all differences between the High Contracting Parties are to be settled by arbitration or judicial decision.

2. The number of Powers sending plenipotentiaries to

the congress to be specified, together with others to be invited to sign the treaty.

3. The Confederation thus formed to guarantee to each of its members the sovereignty of the territories it actually possesses.

4. The Congress to define the cases which would place offending States under the ban of Europe.

5. The Powers to agree to arm and take the offensive, in common and at the common expense, against any State thus banned, until it shall have submitted to the common will.

6. The plenipotentiaries in the congress shall have power to make such rules as they shall judge important, with a view to securing for the European Republic and each of its members all possible advantages.

The learned Abbé's plan sought to establish perpetual peace by mutual guarantees of possession. It was rejected as impracticable because it ignored two persistent tendencies of human nature,—the ambition of rulers on the one hand, and national aspiration for freedom and equality on the other. During the two hundred years that have elapsed since his project was published, it has encountered these two obstacles, and not being able to overcome them, could not be realized. There has never been a time during those centuries when the process of political evolution seemed complete. There were always nations that were not yet satisfied. There was always a longing among suppressed peoples for liberation, and among all nations, except the greatest, for an unattained equality. Is it possible to believe that these conditions have changed, or will change when the peace treaty is signed at Versailles? Alongside the "satisfied nations" there will remain the unsatisfied, and the dissatisfied, even among those who are beneficiaries of the peace.

It has been well said that, if the map of Europe could have been thus perpetuated in the time of the benevolent Marcus Aurelius, when it might have seemed desirable, Europe would still be living under the Roman Empire. There would be to-day, if this had happened in the time of St. Pierre, no French Republic, and no free governments in America. The project would have arrested the entire historic development of Europe. There have been moments when to many that would have seemed to be a happy

event. What a perfect world this would be to inhabit, if the professions of the Holy Alliance could have been permanently carried into effect, when Their Majesties, the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of Russia, "having acquired the intimate conviction of the necessity of settling the steps to be observed by the Powers, in their reciprocal relations, upon the sublime truths which the Holy Religion of our Saviour teaches," solemnly declared "their fixed resolution, both in the administration of their respective States, and in their political relations with every other government, to take for their sole guide the precepts of that Holy Religion, namely, the precepts of Justice, Christian Charity, and Peace, which, far from being applicable only to private concerns must have an immediate influence upon the counsels of Princes, and guide all their steps, as being the only means of consolidating human institutions and remedying their imperfections."

Could any form of words be more inspiring to the believer, or more appealing to his confidence? The "*only* means of consolidating human institutions"! and it really seemed to be true. How rude it must have appeared to Their Majesties—and we always have those who assume that they alone know what is good for the world—when Castlereagh, the clear-headed realist, the soul of loyalty to the Grand Alliance against Napoleon, the apostle of national freedom, voiced the danger of placing all Europe under the control of this vague idealism which, it was soon discovered, served as a mask of the most pernicious despotism, and imperilled the national liberties of all the remainder of the world.

Thanks to the courage of Castlereagh and his determined opposition to the Holy Alliance, that imperial syndicate was broken up. Had it not been thwarted, and had not the influence inspired by Washington and sustained by Monroe and his advisers warned the King of Spain, supported by this conspiracy, not to attempt to reclaim his colonies in America, they would still, no doubt, be dependencies of the Spanish crown, and more than half of the Western Hemisphere would still be monarchical. But if the project of St. Pierre had gone into effect before the American Revolution, there would have been in 1823 no American Republic to hold aloft the standard of liberty and self-government. There would perhaps be even now

no democratic Britain; for the American Revolution was not merely a war for independence, it was a struggle in behalf of inherent human rights and representative government against reactionary absolutism imported into England, which had nearly undone through parliamentary corruption the whole work of the earlier English Revolution.

It is now proposed to base the League of Nations on the permanence of the map of the world as redrawn at Paris, at least so far as the members of the League are concerned. Its motto is, *Beati possidentes*. This is the meaning of Article X, which is the one substantial element in the proposed Constitution. This article binds the High Contracting Parties "to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and the political independence of all States members of the League," present and future. It is a solemn and absolutely binding engagement. Had it been in force before the Spanish-American War, Cuba would probably still be a subject colony of Spain, a scene of continuous revolution, badly governed, the subject of extortion and oppression, and a nuisance to its neighbors; and there is no provision in the Constitution of the League of Nations that would have furnished a remedy. The sinking of the *Maine* would not have been held to justify a war against Spain; for it would have been disavowed, and the sovereignty of Spain protected. There are countries that do not govern well; there are countries that will not govern well; and there are countries that cannot govern well; and the only remedy is revolution. Article X does not, it is true, require aid to a sovereign State in suppressing an unsuccessful revolution; but if any portion of it should attain its independence and the mother country continued at war with it, "external aggression" would be alleged; and the aid of all the High Contracting Parties, economic and even military, could then be invoked against the new claimant of independence.

The perpetual guarantee of territorial integrity, especially when applied to conquered colonies and dependencies, occupied by alien peoples desiring independence, was not one of the objects for which the Entente Allies became associated in the war. It was first suggested in the fourteenth rubric of the compromise peace plan proposed by the President of the United States, who foreshadowed

such a "mutual guarantee" as one of the bases of the "general association" in which the Central Powers were intended also to have a place. The League now to be constituted is far from being such a general association. It is, in effect, a new preponderance of power. The reason why it is acceptable to several of the Powers entering into it is that it affords them this guarantee as against all possible enemies in the future. Their interest is in the acquisition of the wealth, the natural resources, and the potential military efficiency of the United States in a defensive alliance. That was not the original purpose of the President; but that is the price he has had to pay for the realization of his idea of a League of Nations, as distinguished from a permanent Entente with regard to the specific purposes of the war. The European nations would not for a moment have considered the suggestion until the military value of this country had been demonstrated by the part it has taken in the Great War.

Irrespective of any League, the co-belligerents on the side of the Entente Allies are in honor bound to enforce upon the common enemy just terms of peace that will prevent further aggression; but this does not involve the necessity of a permanent engagement to prevent the future dismemberment of surviving empires. It is assumed in this Constitution, and it may be true, that the extensive populations ruled by the countries that now hold them in a relation of dependence are better governed than they would be if they enjoyed self-determination. I have no disposition to raise an issue on this point; but it is not certain that this condition, if it exists, will always remain the same, or that the preservation of territorial integrity, which now covers many conquered peoples, will prove to be the method of justice or conducive to peace. There is, however, in this Constitution, no provision for the "consent of the governed"; and it is not apparent that there could be without a frank abandonment of imperial claims which the High Contracting Parties have no intention to surrender.

Undeniably, by accepting Article X the United States would become an underwriter of imperial insurance in which it would not be, and ought not to ask to be, an equal partner. What the United States would gain by this engagement has never been even considered. On the contrary, all questions of "expediency" have been contemptu-

ously waved aside as unworthy of consideration. But it is more than a question of expediency,—it is a question of principle. The ideal of peace is noble, but it is not the only ideal. We are urged as a duty to sacrifice to it not only our interest but our ideal of freedom, the foundation of our conception of self-government. That we should cherish the ideal of peace, and endeavor in the right way to serve it, is a proposition which no true American will deny; but that we should in any way barter our freedom for it, or abandon our principle of the “consent of the governed,” is a quite different proposal. One would be rendering a better service to his country, and in the end to humanity in general, if he should seek to establish peace in some other way. It is not doubtful that the present generation of Americans, and those that are to follow, can be more serviceable to the highest human interests as a strong, free, and independent people than by being bound to do that against which, when called upon to observe the bond, their consciences as lovers of liberty would revolt.

One of the alleged purposes of the war has been “to make the world safe for democracy.” This Constitution does not carry out that purpose. It does not in any way refer to it. It is a union and an intended domination of Great Powers, and the small States are treated as of secondary importance. They have had thus far no collective voice. They have been permanently relegated to the rear. Far from being recognized as truly “self-determining,” the new nationalities are treated as creations, the handiwork of the potters at Paris, who are moulding them out of the débris of the extinct autocracies, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and Turkey, whose populations have been left in turmoil and turbulence by the fall of the only governments they ever knew.

During the protracted negotiations at Paris regarding the League of Nations, a new enemy has arisen,—a form of internationalism more dangerous than any single coalition. It aims at the life of nations and would destroy all national existence. It is, therefore, a time to think first of the national life, to maintain it in its strength, its purity, its freedom, and its established foundations. Nothing but a vigorous nationalism can overcome this insidious enemy, which would divide every house against itself. It is a time, therefore, for every free, self-governing nation to be a

master in its own house. Its association with other nations should look toward a peace based on justice with all of them, a willingness to help, but not to be bound. It is timely to face this new and all pervading menace of Bolshevism, to isolate it, to circumscribe it, and to exterminate it. The Constitution of the League of Nations ignores this problem. Some of its advocates even seem to dally with it.

Two obvious duties lie before the Entente Allies: first, to destroy, not Germany, but German militarism, by imposing a peace of victory over militarism through geographic limitation under conditions of disarmament; and, second, to reinforce that limitation through geographic circumscription, by the formation of new independent States, so as to create a barrier on the East and Southeast against the German appropriation of Russia. The order of the day should be, first peace, and then an affirmation of the restored existence of a Society of States based on their inherent rights under International Law, with a pledge to respect, improve, and apply it judicially.

If the conflict with Germany were ended, an understanding between the Powers now deliberating at Paris, and a united effort to respect and defend International Law if again violated, would go far toward securing the peace of the entire world for some years to come. Instead of allowing Bolshevism to spread, and permitting Germany to enter into alliance with it until she can appropriate its spoils, a new order of normal State existence should be aimed at, in which an assenting Germany can participate before she is destroyed.

When peace is once established, it is the Society of States, not a defensive League within it, likely to be counterpoised by another political combination of the same kind, that should be instituted. But this is not the work of war. It is essentially a work of peace, to be elaborated in a time of peace. The first condition of it is not a self-protective and dominant League; but an open forum, where the small States, unintimidated, may freely voice their necessities, not to a junta of Great Powers, but to the world at large; which will then quickly discover which nation is deserving of aid and sympathy. For this the Constitution of a League of Nations makes no provision. It demands that we shall walk by faith and not by sight; and that we shall place our faith not in open discussion, not in the disinterested judg-

ment of mankind, but in the wisdom, the virtue, and the unselfishness of an international *imperium*, constructed and designed primarily to secure its own immunity by maintaining a predominant collective force, and secondarily to convert the small States into virtual protectorates under its own laws.

Instead of a directory in Paris, working *in camera*, hedged about with secrecy, forming new nations out of the débris of these disintegrated empires, and setting up a separate and exclusive control by Great Powers, the appeal should be to the smaller States and to the newly liberated nationalities to express their desires and preferences, and together to unite in determining their own future destinies. They should be told: We shall now treat and help you as free peoples. We ask you to cease fighting and choose your own representatives. We shall aid you as far as we can in securing an adjustment of your differences and shall respect your self-determination, but we must do this impartially in response to your wishes. We shall open the ways of communication and commerce, but if you fight it will be at your own peril and the effect of your quarrels will be to close the avenues of trade.

This is not the manner in which the Conference at Paris is proceeding. It is a secret conclave, conducted by a Supreme Council composed of Great Powers, with a growing tendency to leave all decisions to the "Big Four." It is reconstructing Europe in its own way, and presumably in its own interest. It proposes a close corporation for the future, acting in secret, to secure its own peace and dictate the peace of the world upon the basis of a map of its own making. The Great Powers claim to be just, virtuous, and even benevolent, and perhaps they are, but the Holy Alliance a hundred years ago also claimed the noblest intentions.

It is interesting to note how democracy, in the end, has usually inadvertently played into the hands of autocracy, and confided its destinies to a single dominant will. When the Directory was formed at Paris, in the French Revolution, and the directors met to fortify their control, their first thought was of organization; but at their first meeting it was observed that it was unnecessary;—Bonaparte had already taken his seat at the head of the table! No one disputed his right to remain there. Was he not necessary

to the cause? Had he not fought successfully the battles of democracy? Democracy, it appeared, could not be imperilled by its most valiant apostle.

The small States—the truly democratic States—wait in the anteroom while the “Big Four” decide the fate of Europe. The Executive Council, when the League is adopted, is to take their place. Democracy will, of course, be safe; for our President is named in Article IV of the Constitution as the person to summon the first meeting of the Body of Delegates, and of the Executive Council. He, of course, represents democracy,—at least the type of democracy which he represents. We shall in time, perhaps, learn what it is.

There might, however, in the interest of democracy, be some additional assurance in the Constitution of the League of Nations itself; but, when we examine it, we find that it contains no declaration of principles which the members are pledged to respect and support. There is no Bill of Rights, defining the essential and immutable prerogatives of sovereign States,—not a word in the entire document to indicate that States possess any inherent and sovereign rights whatever. Nothing is said of the right of “self-determination,” nothing of any rights as belonging to the “people” anywhere. The whole document is devoted to the interests of Governments. There is even no indication of any right in any people to be directly represented in this corporation of State interests. The only reference to the people in this Constitution, aside from the power and prerogatives of States and Governments, is in Article XX, which promises to establish a permanent Bureau of Labor, with implicit power to regulate the conditions of industry, “both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend”; that is, it would appear, to prescribe the conditions of labor in all the countries of the world, whether members of the League or not.

The most pernicious vice in the system of ideas upon which this League is founded is that peace can be secured, without the existence of immense armed forces, by artificial lines drawn on a map.

A great force of cartographers has been employed at Paris in dissecting out of the conglomeration of races the various nationalities, and circumscribing them by lines of

geographic demarcation. The secret of peace does not lie in geography, but in institutions, political and economic. The one great lesson that constitutional self-government has taught is that peace and contentment are not created by geographic boundaries, but by just laws and the economic opportunities afforded under a good government. The precise delimitation of races in the Near East,—the débris of the Turkish Empire, for example,—is a physical impossibility. There cannot be created a Czecho-Slovakia, a Jugoslavia, an Armenia, a Poland, or a Syria, where the population will be entirely homogeneous, without impracticable migrations. There will always be left enclaves or transfusions of distinct races. We should never dream of such an operation in the United States. We merge our population by our institutions. Given constitutional guarantees, representative government, and the abolition of hyphenism—that is, the total obliteration of race distinctions—and the problem of government is solved. If we undertook to set up in America the conception of race-nationality as a basis of government, we should plunge this nation into civil war. And the attempt to do this in Europe will have no other result.

The whole conception of race-nationality is fallacious and involves a new danger. Its logical outcome is a struggle for race domination, as Pan-Germanism well illustrated. Wider territorial expansion was demanded, in order that a prolific race might always remain under the same political régime. This is the basis of the present efforts at scientific race cartography. It will prove illusory. It is for the peoples by choice and agreement to make the map, and not the ethnographers.

In the United States, and in America generally, no map has ever been made by a Supreme Council. The existing map has been made by the peoples who inhabit this continent, or by negotiation with other peoples; not always without conflict, but always followed with consent. It may not be a perfect map, but it is more generally assented to than one which a Supreme Council could have imposed. We, in America, have protected our sister republics from foreign intervention, but we have never pretended to portion out the continent among them.

The principle followed in constituting the new nationalities and fixing their frontiers is of importance chiefly in

its relation to future peace. Unless they are satisfied there will be continued rivalries and possible conflict. If Article X is retained in the Constitution of the League of Nations, there can be no change in the map when once the Constitution is adopted. Self-determination, so far as national allegiance is concerned, will then be finally repressed. If it is to have any recognition, it must be respected now; if not, all the members of the League will be arrayed against freedom and compelled to defend by force mistakes that might have been avoided.

By whatever standard we judge it, it is evident that the League of Nations, in proportion as it is to be real, is not the ultimate international ideal. It is, and by its essential nature must be, a combination of Powers within the wider Society of States. So far as the President of the United States is concerned with it, it was appealed to as a compromise expedient in the midst of war, in order to provide a means of reconciliation between the Entente Allies and the Central Powers. That was the purpose of the fourteen rubrics, and the League of Nations is merely the vehicle for enforcing them.

But the problem now is not reconciliation, and it never was. The real problem was and is to show the Central Powers, and particularly Germany, that ruthless aggression and violation of the Law of Nations cannot be tolerated, and cannot escape a just punishment. The whole future of the Society of States depends absolutely on that. There must be a peace of victory and not a peace of compromise, or there will never be any sure peace in the world.

The President has never entertained this idea. He still holds to his fourteen points of compromise as the only ground of reconciliation with criminal nations. They must cease to be criminal and pay the penalty of their crimes. After that they can take their places, if they confess and abandon their faults, in the free and responsible Society of States.

The idea of the League has been to bring them into it upon a basis of equality in the treaty of peace itself. That is why the Constitution of the League and the treaty of peace were to be so interwoven and compacted that they could not be separated, and that no nation could make peace without accepting the League. If Germany signed that treaty, she also would accept the League; and, having

accepted it, with all its obligations, why should she then not become a member of it?

That, in brief, is the whole content of the dogma of the League. If Germany and other nations were really penitent, really virtuous, really minded to submit to International Law, to respect it, and to maintain it, the League would be a superfluity. But if Germany and other nations are not so minded, then they have no proper place in it; and such a place should not be prepared for them.

Finally, the President's dogma breaks on the determination of the Entente to remain an entente, no matter by what name it is called. The basis of that Entente was and remains that the aggressor must be defeated and punished for crime, not welcomed into a fraternity of equals. Unless the President accepts that conclusion, he and the Conference at Paris have nothing in common. If he does accept it, the League, as it must be amended before it can be adopted, is in its essence nothing but a written form of an understanding for mutual defense against an enemy not wholly overcome. If the enemy had been made to acknowledge defeat at the moment when he really was defeated, all this circumlocution would have been avoided. The Entente would have obtained *la victoire intégrale* and a chastened Germany would now be rehabilitating her national life, as it is her right and duty to do, in order to suppress Bolshevism instead of allying herself with it, and preparing to take a normal and useful part in the Society of States.

DAVID JAYNE HILL.